



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sel and client, and for the former to reach the place of the taking of the deposition and to return in time for trial.

Unauthorized Operation by Surgeon Constitutes an Assault.—In *Mohr v. Williams* (Minn.), 104 N. W. 13, it was held, that a surgeon was guilty of assault and battery where he, without the consent of his patient while she was under an anæsthetic, performed an operation on her left ear when she had instructed him to perform an operation on her right ear. The court decided that the surgeon was guilty notwithstanding the fact that he proved that it was necessary to perform the operation on the left ear, and notwithstanding the fact that there was an entire absence of evil intent.

Eavesdropping.—Prosecutions for eavesdropping are now so very rare that many have forgotten that it was ever a crime. In the case of *State v. Davis*, 51 S. E. 897, an indictment for eavesdropping was declared defective because it failed to allege that the conduct described was habitual and that the conversation overheard by the defendant was repeated in the hearing of divers persons.

Right of Privacy—Va. Code 1904, Sec. 2897a.—In recent years quite a number of courts of last resort have been called upon to decide whether there is any such thing as the "right of privacy." Perhaps the most celebrated case on the subject is *Roberson v. Rochester*, 59 L. R. A. 478, in which Judge A. B. Parker delivered the opinion of the court. In this case there was a very strong dissenting opinion. The right of privacy has to some extent received statutory recognition in Virginia. Sec. 2897a, Va. Code 1904, prohibits the unauthorized use of one's name or picture for advertising purposes or for the purposes of trade. In the recent case of *Cyrus v. The Boston Chemical Company*, the law and equity court of the city of Richmond decided that independently of statute the law gave no right of action for the unauthorized use of one's picture for advertising purposes. The contrary view seems to be taken in the recent case of *Pavesich v. New England Life Ins. Company* (Ga.), 50 S. E. 68. See, also, 10 Va. Law Reg. 824; 11 Va. Law Reg. 63.

Husband and Wife—Liability of Husband for Support of Wife Who Has Been Removed by Due Process of Law to Public Asylum for Insane.—The liability of a husband for the support of his wife at an asylum for the insane, to which she has been removed by due process of law, is denied in *Richardson v. Stuesser* (Wis.), 69 L. R. A. 829, in the absence of a statute expressly imposing such liability.